



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/631,068	07/31/2003	Yen-Fu Chen	AUS920030521US1	3486

45371 7590 06/14/2007  
IBM CORPORATION (RUS)  
c/o Rudolf O Siegesmund Gordon & Rees, LLp  
2100 Ross Avenue  
Suite 2600  
DALLAS, TX 75201

EXAMINER
----------

UTAMA, ROBERT J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3714

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/14/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/631,068	Applicant(s) CHEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Robert J. Utama	Art Unit 3714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-6,8-15,17-19 and 21-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-6,8-15,17-19 and 21-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 3714

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Status of Claim***

1. This office action is a response for the amendment filed on: 04/05/2007. The current status of claims are as follow: Claims 1, 4-6, 8-15, 17-19 and 21-26 are still pending and claims 2-3, 7, 16, 20 and 27-41 are cancelled.

### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claim 12-13, 15 and 25-26 objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claims 12 and 13, which are dependant upon claim 1, recite the limitation of question and answer language of English, Traditional Chinese, Simplified Chinese and Pinyin. These limitations are already recited in claim 1. Similarly, the same line of reasoning can also be applied with regards to claim 15, 25 and 26.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claim 1 and 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stansvik US 2003/0027122, in view of Edberg 5,873,111 and in view of Kobayashi 2001/0019329**

**Claim 1, 14 and 15:** Stansvik provide a teaching of a computer-implemented method for reviewing vocabulary comprising of: using a computer and a graphical user interface on a

Art Unit: 3714

display connected to a computer and responsive to a user selecting a chapter from a plurality of chapters in a text book (see Stansvik paragraph 70), displaying a plurality of vocabulary word from a chapter (see Stansvik paragraph 45), displaying a vocabulary word in the question language and responsive to the user inputting an answer in the answer language, determining if the answer is a correct answer (see Stansvik FIG.5). Stansvik also provided a teaching if the answer is a correct answer is performed by determining whether the vocabulary of the word and the answer both match an entry in dictionary encoded (see Stansvik paragraph 57).

However, Stansvik is silent on what kind of encoding used in the dictionary. Edberg provide a teaching in the background of the invention that an electronic dictionary is better served when implemented using the Unicode encoding (see Edberg '111 col. 2:7-25 and col. 3:9-42). Therefore, one of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated to use Unicode as an encoding system of the word in the dictionary, because Unicode encoding would have allow for a better representation of different character/symbol that is unique of each particular language (see Edberg 2:7-25).

Stansvik failed to provide a teaching where the question language and answer language is selected from English and Chinese and user selecting a chapter from Chinese/English textbook or determining whether the vocabulary word and the answer both match an entry in Traditional Chinese/Pin Yin/English dictionary. However, the examiner takes **OFFICIAL NOTICE** that teaching of English by selecting a chapter from a Chinese-English textbook; and selecting answer question and question language in English or Chinese are old and well known in the art of foreign language education. Therefore, it would have been obvious that the one of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated to add the feature of selecting a chapter from a Chinese-English textbook; and selecting answer question and question language in English or Chinese into the system of Stansvik because it would enable the teaching of the Chinese language.

Art Unit: 3714

The examiner also recognized the unique relationship between traditional Chinese, simplified Chinese and pin yin as being recognized in the art as writing systems that are commonly associated with the Chinese language. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to include the feature of having different Chinese writing system (scripts) in order to provide the user with full literacy within the known Chinese writing system.

Stansvik fail to provide a teaching on responsive to the vocabulary word or the answer being in Simplified Chinese, translating the vocabulary word or the answer into Traditional Chinese by accessing a Simplified/Traditional Chinese database. However, Kobayashi provide a teaching on responsive to the vocabulary word or the answer, translating the vocabulary word or the answer into Simplified Chinese by accessing a Simplified/Traditional Chinese database (see Kobayashi Paragraph 91 and 46 and FIG. 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one ordinary skilled in the art to include the feature of translating the vocabulary word or the answer into Simplified Chinese by accessing a Simplified/Traditional Chinese database, as taught by Kobayashi, in order to show the student the characterization of Chinese words using the traditional Chinese or simplified Chinese.

**Claim 4 and 17:** Stansvik provided a teaching of displaying a statistic regarding the user's performance in answering plurality of question (see FIG. 9 and paragraph 37).

**Claim 10 and 24:** Stansvik fails to provide a teaching on changing the font size of the characters displayed on the graphical user interface. However, the examiner takes **OFFICIAL NOTICE** that the feature of changing the font size of the characters displayed on the graphical user interface is old and well known in the art of document printing and processing. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to include the feature changing the font size of the characters displayed on the graphical user interface in order to accommodate user's preference for larger or smaller font size.

**Claim 12-13 and 25-26:** Stansvik failed to provide a teaching where the question language and answer language is selected from English and Chinese and user selecting a chapter from

Art Unit: 3714

Chinese/English textbook. However, the examiner takes **OFFICIAL NOTICE** that teaching of English by selecting a chapter from a Chinese-English textbook; and selecting answer question and question language in English or Chinese are old and well known in the art of foreign language education. Therefore, it would have been obvious that the one of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated to add the feature of selecting a chapter from a Chinese-English textbook; and selecting answer question and question language in English or Chinese into the system of Stansvik because it would enable the teaching of the Chinese language.

5. **Claim 5-6, 8-13, 15, 17-19, 21-26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stansvik US 2003/0027122 and in view of Kobayashi 2001/0019329 and further in view of Parry et al 6,077,08599**

**Claim 5-6 and 18-19:** Stanvik fails to provide a teaching on calculating the probability factors of vocabulary words, wherein the probability factors determine the probability (or frequency) that the vocabulary word appear in question.

However, Parry provides a teaching of on calculating the probability factors of vocabulary words, wherein the probability factors determine the probability (or frequency) that the vocabulary word appear in question (see Parry col. 18:60-19:11). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one of ordinary skilled in the art to include the features of on calculating the probability factors of vocabulary words, wherein the probability factors determine the probability (or frequency) that the vocabulary word appear in question, as taught by Parry, into the combination of Stanvik and Kobayashi because it would enable the system to optimizes the study time by identifying areas where the student need to focus on (Parry Col. 3:5-20).

**Claim 8-9 and 21-22:** Stansvik fails to provide a teaching where if the response to a determination that the answer is correct, decrementing probability factor for the vocabulary

Art Unit: 3714

word and if the response to a determination that the answer is incorrect, incrementing probability factor for the vocabulary word.

However, Parry provide a teaching where if the response to a determination that the answer is correct, decrementing probability factor for the vocabulary word and if the response to a determination that the answer is incorrect, incrementing probability factor for the vocabulary word (see Parry col. 18:60-19:11). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one of ordinary skilled in the art to include the features of on if the response to a determination that the answer is correct, decrementing probability factor for the vocabulary word and if the response to a determination that the answer is incorrect, incrementing probability factor for the vocabulary word, as taught by Parry, into the combination of Stansvik and Kobayashi because it would enable the system to optimizes the study time by identifying areas where the student need to focus on (Parry Col. 3:5-20).

**Claim 10 and 23:** Stansvik fails to provide a teaching where is responsive to a determination that all vocabulary words in a chapter have a probability of one, indicating that the chapter is completed.

However, Parry provide a teaching where is responsive to a determination that all vocabulary words in a chapter have a probability of one, indicating that the chapter is completed (see Parry col. 19:51-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one of ordinary skilled in the art to include the features of on if the response to a determination that the answer is correct, decrementing probability factor for the vocabulary word and if the response to a determination that the answer is incorrect, incrementing probability factor for the vocabulary word, as taught by Parry, into the combination of Stansvik and Kobayashi because it would enable the system to optimizes the study time by identifying areas where the student need to focus on (Parry Col. 3:5-20).

Art Unit: 3714

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1, 4-6, 8-15, 17-19 and 21-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

7. Applicant's arguments and amendment is effective to remove the 112 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph rejection towards the independent claim 1, 14 and 27. The rejection has subsequently been withdrawn.

8. The applicant argues that previous prior art does not disclose the teaching of giving the user an option to choose from four different answer and question languages. Both the previously presented prior art and the currently applied prior does not explicitly provide such teaching. However, the examiner disagrees with the applicant's interpretation that the choosing between Pin Yin, Traditional Chinese and Simplified Chinese constitutes choosing between different languages. The examiner also recognized the limitation of traditional Chinese, simplified Chinese and pin yin as being recognized in the art as writing systems that are commonly associated with the Chinese language. Hence, the examiner treating such limitation to mean choosing between Chinese and English language for the answer and question languages.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert J. Utama whose telephone number is (571) 272-1676. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pezutto can be reached on (571)272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Art Unit: 3714

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RU

  
**KATHLEEN MOSSER**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
**ART UNIT 3714**